DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 378 718 EC 303 614

AUTHOR Bauer, Norman J.
TITLE The Politics of Inclusion: A Dissenting Perspective.
PUB DATE 21 Apr 94
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the New York State Association of Teacher Educators (Syracuse, NY, April 21, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; Educational Change; *Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; Humanitarianism; *Humanization; *Inclusive Schools; Mainstreaming; *Politics of Education; Regular and Special Education Relationship; *Special Education

ABSTRACT

American society has consistently pursued a political vision of humanitarian development--a vision of a free, open, and liberating pluralistic society. One of the crucial problems confronting society is how to provide an education for all children. The idea of including children and youth with significant disabilities in regular classrooms is a completely illogical way to improve the quality of learning. Inclusion would destroy the domain of special education, which has been developing analytical techniques and methodological skills designed to handle various disabilities over the last 45 years. Many parents probably do not want to compel their children to associate with students who have so much more capacity to learn. Inclusion of children with disabilities creates a contradictory environment for teachers who are expected to get their students to achieve at high levels. The quality of learning will decrease as public schools become a dumping ground for students with disabilities. Expensive reductions in class size will be necessary as children with disabilities are integrated. Recommendations are offered, focusing on convening state educational summits, expressing concerns to political leaders, generating professional development programs, and educating parents. Special educators are urged to ensure that only those students who need their specialized treatment are considered disabled and others are returned to the regular classrooms. (Contains 20 references.) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ED 378 718

THE POLITICS OF INCLUSION
A DISSENTING PERSPECTIVE

NORMAN J. BAUER, Ed.D.
PROFESSOR OF SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
GENESEO, NEW YORK

ANNUAL SPRING CONFERENCE
OF
NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION
OF
TEACHER EDUCATORS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Norman J. Bauer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Ramada Inn
1305 Buckley Road
Syracuse, NY 13212

APRIL 21-21, 1994

EC 303614

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE POLITICS OF INCLUSION

A DISSENTING PERSPECTIVE

NORMAN J. BAUER, Ed.D.
APRIL 21, 1994

"But the other students in our classrooms have rights too. They have the right to a safe, orderly classroom. They have the right to a teacher's attention when *they* need help. They have the right to a teacher who is fresh and energetic enough to plan for *them*. They have a right to a teacher who feels respected and supported."

Idstein

"While Americans talk about improving education, establishing national goals and standards, professionalizing teaching and empowering individual schools to be creative, something is happening that will wipe out the benefits of all these changes. That is the move toward requiring that students with extreme emotional/behavioral problems be educated in regular classrooms. This subject is not much talked about because it is not politically correct to do so. Proposals to educate such students separately are met with arguments to the effect that separate is never

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> equal and that the separation of violent and disruptive students is just as immoral as legally sanctioned racial segregation."
>
> Shanker

> "The school (P.S. 24 in New York city) is integrated in the strict sense that the middle- and upper-middle-class white children here do occupy a building that contains some Asian and Hispanic and black children; but there is little integration in the classrooms since the vast majority of the Hispanic and black children are assigned to "special" classes on the basis of evaluations that have classified them "EMR" - "educably mentally retarded" - or else, in the words of cases, "TMR" - "trainable mentally retarded." The school therefore contains effectively two separate schools: one of about 130 children, most of whom are poor, Hispanic, black, assigned to one of 12 special classes; the other of some 700 mainstream students, almost all of whom are white or Asian."
>
> Kozol

> "... too many children were getting put in special education because teachers didn't have the time to help them in the regular classroom."
>
> Wertheimer

Purpose

The purposes of this paper are:

(1) To examine the notion of 'all' as it relates to the 'inclusion' movement;

(2) To identify examples of the goals of public schools in a liberal democratic society;

(3) To identify a number of significant reasons why this writer takes a dissenting position regarding the inclusion movement; and

(4) To recommend five actions which might be taken to avoid the problems suggested by these reasons.

Assumptions

The writer has based this paper on his acceptance of the following assumptions:

(1) We live in a liberal, constitutional democracy in which every reasonable effort is made to guarantee the full intellectual, moral, social and skill developmental needs of ALL children and youth.

(2) Public schools are a vital institution in the achievement of these developmental needs.

(3) There is evidence to suggest that, in a large number of areas of our country, particularly urban areas, the funding of our schools is not adequate to provide the amount and quality of professional services necessary to handle these developmental needs.

(4) In order to achieve these needs a variety of professional services are required.

(5) Some of these services require highly specialized services from highly trained professionals; such services cost a substantial amount of money.

Foundations

Let me commence with a brief, historical overview of the emergence of the 'A' word; that simple, yet highly moral, very meaningful and powerful word that permeates discussions relative to *inclusion* , ' the word we know of as 'ALL'.

The decisions by our federal government to provide ALL of our citizens with opportunities to be included in the riches

and benefits of our free and open society has had a long history to it.

One can go back to the adoption of the first Ten Amendments, the original Bill of Rights, passed by Congress on September 25, 1789; ratified by the states on December 15, 1791. Clearly, the first sixteen words of the First Amendment, *Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibting the free exercise thereof; ...* revealed a deep desire on the part of our founding fathers to welcome religious beliefs of ALL persuasions in our country, and to enable those who adhered to these beliefs to engage in their religious services as each saw fit.

A second major contribution to "The Gradual Advancement of the Human Species in Dignity and Happiness" about which Mann spoke during the commencement proceedings which saw him graduate with honors in 1919 from Brown University, was the movement in the nation for free public schools. (Rippa, 97). In his *Twelfth Report* (1848) he stressed the fact that "It knows no distinction of rich and poor, of bond and free,... it throws open its doors, and spreads the table of its bounty, for ALL* the children of the state." (Rippa, 101).

A decade and a half later, in 1862, Lincoln issued his great *Emancipation Proclamation*, a statement which would ultimately result in the destruction of slavery, and include all people, regardless of color, in the political and social system in our society. Following the war we witnessed the

quick adoption on December 6, 1865, of the Thirteenth Amendment, (neither slavery or involuntary servitude would be accepted), on July 9, 1868, of the Fourteenth Amendment (due process and equal protection of the law), on Feb. 3, 1870, of the Fifteenth Amendment (voting could not be restricted by color). Each was designed to include ALL people of color in our

*Note: Throughout this paper whenever the word 'all is shown this way it means that it was included in lower case letters in the original.

country's political and social system.

Then, on August 18, 1920, again at the federal level, though with the concurrence of many of our states, we saw the adoption of the 19th amendment; ALL women in our country would hereafter have an opportunity to cast a ballot, to participate in our political process.

Following the Second World war we witnessed the historic Brown decision by the Warren court, arguably one this country's most significant supreme court decisions. No longer would it be possible to justify the separation of people of color from the mainstream of life. ALL would be included in our educational, social, economic and political system.

A few years later, during the summer of 1958, largely in reaction to the cold war relationship which had developed between the Soviet Union and the United States subsequent to the end of World War II, we witnessed the passage of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA). At that time, because

of the presumed threat which the Soviet Union posed to our country as a consequence of their launching of Sputnik, the political leadership of our country developed a deep interest in identifying the capacities of our young people; particularly those geared toward mathematics, science and foreign language. In order to identify these capacities a cadre of school counselors was needed; and forthwith, we observed a substantial growth of this group of school professionals. As the years went by these counselors found it necessary increasingly to collaborate with classroom teachers in identifying and handling the needs of ALL the young people attending our public schools.

A few years later, in 1964, we adopted the Civil Rights Act, a sweeping piece of nondiscriminative, inclusive legislation, which was designed to eliminate discriminatory actions in the realm of voting, jobs, housing and education. No longer would large segments of our population find themselves excluded from these realms of human rights. ALL would have equal opportunities to live, to work, to attend school, to vote.

During the summer of 1965 Congress adopted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), a bold, awesome piece of legislation, designed to improve the quality of schooling throughout our country, particularly in the urban areas. Out of this act we saw emerge programs such as head start, follow-through, upward-bound, each designed to provide opportunities for ALL our youth, regardless of their ethnic roots, to experience the fruits of excellent educational

programs.

This was followed closely by the empowerment of ALL those eighteen and over with the power to vote; and by the adoption of Title IX which provided opportunities for ALL girls and women to pursue athletic development during their school years with the same facilities, the same financial support, as that which was provided men.

Then, in 1975, P.L. 94-142, The Education for ALL Handicapped Children Act was adopted by Congress. It was based on the following premses:

- a free, appropriate public education must be provided all children, without cost to their parents and regardless of severity or type of disability;

- protective, due process rights must be ensured all children with disabilities and their parents to ensure free, fair, and unbiased assessment, placement, and programming for students with special needs;

- education in the least restrictive envionment must be provided; that is, to the maximum extent possible "students with disabilities must be educated with children who are not handicapped";

- individualized education programming, in the form of an individualized education plan (IEP), must be developed for each student ... IEPs must be developed by a committee composed of at least the child's teacher, the parent, a representative of the local school district and, when appropriate, the student; and

- parental involvement is required for all decisions

regarding the programming for students with special needs. Parents are to be involved in decisions unless they specifically waive the right to do so.. ("Winners all..." 6-7)

Most recently we witnessed the adoption by Congress, on July 26, 1990, of P.L. 101-336, the Americans With Disabilities Act. This piece of legislation was designed to guarantee that no qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any such entity. (P.L. 101-336).

Just as Jones (Jones, I) described the contentious opposition to ADA which confronted the path of ADA towards its adoption as nothing short of torturous, so, too, did the *Philadelphia National Gazetter,* on July 10, 1830, criticize editorially the equalitarian demands of the workers at that time when it proclaimed "Universal opulence, or even competency, is a chimera, as man and society are constituted. There will ever be distinctions of conditions, of capacity, of knowledge and ignorance, in spite of the fond conceits which may be indulged, or the wild projects which may be tried, to the contrary. The "peasant" must labor during those hours of the day, which his wealthy neighbor can give to the abstract culture of his mind." (Rippa, 93).

One can conclude from this brief overview of the concept of 'ALL', with a large measure of certainty, that our society has consistently pursued, contentious and oppositional as this

pursuit has been at times, a noble, political vision of humanitarian development; a vision of a free, open and liberating pluralistic society. Indeed, as Rippa has so insightfully argued, "... a public school open to *all* is the most distinctive feature of American education. It was a nineteenth-century ideal that has endured to the present time." (Rippa, 110).

Goals of American Schools

Inclusion of disabled children and youth in our public schools, in the least restrictive classroom environments, must be counted as one more means which our culture is considering in this enlarging, politically significant, humanitarian march. Perhaps, if one thinks about the long-term consequences for our society, it is arguably as significant an aim as any of the preceding. For certainly, as a nation perceives and supports the educational development of its children, so, too, will that nation shape its future.

It is to the consideration of these goals, these aims, that we will now direct our discussion. Frequently the aims which have directed our schools have been defined by national committees. The Committee of Ten, established by the National Education Association in 1992, chaired by Charles W. Eliot,made up primarily of subject matter specialists, recommended that the aim of the curriculum ought to be to prepare students both for adult life and for college. Indeed, guided by Eliot's firm hand and commitment to the developoment of reasoning power as the

central function of the schools, "there would be no curricular distinction between those students who were preparing for college and those who were preparing for "life . . . ALL students, the Committee reasoned, regardless of destination, were entitled to the best ways of teaching the various subjects. What is more, education for life, they maintained, *is* education for college, and the colleges should accept a good education for life as the proper preparation for the rigors of college studies." (National Education Association, 12).

The high school curriculum which they proposed to achieve this aim consisted largely of traditional subjects, including English, math, history, science, Latin, and, in something of a modification of tradition, the acceptance of modern romance languages.

The Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (1918), another creation of the National Educational Association, represented something of a progressive change, which was destined to be largely administrative in character. The Commission's aim, reminiscent of the Committee of Ten, was "to provide the basis for designing a basic curriculum for ALL youth, not just those who would go on to college." (Walker and Soltis, 19).

Their proposal, commonly referred to as the *Cardinal Principles,* cited as the aims of schools health, command of fundamental processes, worthy home membership, vocation, citizenship, worthy use of leisure and ethical character.

(Cardinal principles, 10-11).

Two enduring structural inventions for pursuing the purposes of the Commission, each designed to promote the attainment of the seven principles and link education with real life, were the comprehensive high school and the development of the junior high school. (Walker and Soltis, 19).

Two decades later the Educational Policies Commission, appointed by the National Education Assocation and the American Association of School Administrators, addressed the problem of education in our democratic society. They opened their work with the following words from "The Children's Charter":

> "For every child a school which is safe from hazards, sanitary, properly equipped, lighted, and ventilated. For younger children nursery schools and kindergartens to supplement home care . . . .
>
> "For every child an education which, through the discovery and development of his individual abilities, prepares him for life; and through training and vocational guidance prepares him for a living which will yield him the maximum of satisfaction . . . .
>
> "For every child who is blind, deaf, crippled, or otherwise physically handicapped, and for the child who is mentally handicapped, such measures as will early discover and diagnose his handicap, provide care and treatment, and so train him that he may become an asset to society rather than a liability. Expenses of these services should be borne publicly where they cannot be privately met.
>
> "For every child who is in conflict with society the right to be dealt with intelligently as society's charge, not society's outcast; with the home, the school, the

> church, the court and the institution when needed, shaped to return him whenever possible to the normal stream of life." (Opening page, The Structure and Administration of). ...

This was followed by the assertion that "special adjustments should be made throughout the school system to care for the handicapped. . . . In the cases of . . . handicapped children, their segregation in special classes has often resulted in more efficient school service. The organization of these special opportunities should not deny to handicapped children association with the entire group in those activities in which it is possible for them to participate successfully." (The Structure and Administration . . . , 3-4). The Commission concluded their text with the proposition that "the maintenance of our democracy is dependent upon the education of ALL of its citizens," (The Structure and Administration of ..., 116).

In a subsequent publication entitled Education for ALL(emphasis a part of the original title) American Youth - A Further Look, the Educational Policies Commission proclaimed "When we write confidently and *inclusively* (italics by this writer) about education for *all* (italics in the original) youth, we mean just that. We mean that ALL youth, with their human similarities and their equally human differences, should have educational services and opportunities suited to their personal needs and sufficient for the successful operation of a free and democratic society." (Education for all . . . , 29).

One can rightly conclude from the foregoing efforts that

one of the crucial problems confronting a free and open society like the United States is just how to provide an education for ALL of its citizens. In the mid-40's a committee of faculty at Harvard produced a report in which they stipulated that, in a free society such as ours, "... education seeks to do two things: help young persons fulfill the unique particular function in life which is in them to fulfill, and fit them so far as it can for those common spheres which as citizens and heirs of a joint culture they will share with others . . . The ideal is a system which shall be as fair to the fast as to the slow, to the hand-minded as to the book-minded, but which, while meeting the separate needs of each, shall yet foster that fellow feeling between human being and human being which is the deepest root of democracy." (Report of the Harvard Committee, 4,9.)

In 1963, in a book which has received far too little attention in professional circles, Harry Broudy , B. Othanel Smith, and Joe Burnett claimed that "The American ethos affirms that the technolgoical resources of modern society can and should be exploited to enhance the excellence and significance of ALL , rather than an elite. . . .(Broudy et al., 6). They then proceeded to develop a program for the secondary school which featured a common curriculum, basically the same for ALL. This program consisted of the following components: symbolics of information (languages and mathematics), basic sciences, developmental studies (evolution of the cosmos, of social institutions, and of man's culture), exemplars (the arts)

and moral problems (typical social problems). (Broudy et al., 64-65). A unique attribute of their proposal was that the school not be divided into grades, and that students be free to proceed at their own pace through the studies offered.

Additional proposals for improving schooling in our country have emanated from a number of other significant sources. In April, 1983, A Nation at Risk argued that 'we must emphasize the variety of student aspirations, abilities, and preparation requires that appropriate content be available to satisfy diverse needs. . . . that a solid high school education is within the reach of virtually ALL . . ." (Gardner, 24).

In March, 1991, The New Compact for Learning in New York State included as its final component "The Regents Bill of Rights for Children - An Education Charter for the Decade of the Child." In this statement, the regents proclaimed:

1. ALL children have the right to a healthy, secure, nurturing infancy and early childhood.

2. ALL children have the right to live in circumstances which permit healthy intellectual, emotional, physical, and moral development.

3. ALL childiren have the right to a free, sound, basic education.

4. Each child has the right to an education appropriate for his or her individual needs.

5. ALL children have the right to an education which respects their culture, race, socioeconomic background, and the

language of their home.

6. ALL children have the right to schools and educational programs which are effective.

7. ALL children have the right to educational programs which prepare them for jobs, for college, for responsible family life, and for citizenship in a self-governing society.

8. ALL children have the right to the resources needed to secure their educational rights.

9. ALL children have the right to pursue their education without fear.

10. ALL children are entitled to an education which involves responsibilities as well as rights. (A new compact. . . . 20).

And, as this paper is being written, the Congress of the United States is debating the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Title 1, "National Education Goals" states that "By the year 2000, ALL (emphasis by this writer) children in America will start school ready to learn. . . . that ALL children will have access to high-quality and developmentally appropriate preschool programs that help prepare children for school. . . . ALL children will receive the nutrition and health care needed to arrive at school with healthy minds and bodies, and to maintain the mental alertness necessary to be prepared to learn, and the number of low-birthweight babies will be significantly reduced through enhanced prenatal health systems. . . . By the year 2000 ALL will leave grades 4,8,and 12 having

demonstrted competency over challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, arts, history, and geogrphy, and every school in America will ensure that ALL students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, futher learning, and productive employment in our modern economy. . . . that the academic performance of ALL students at the elementary and secondary level will increase significantly in every quartile, ... the percentage of ALL students who demonstrate the ability to reason, solve problems, apply knowledge, and write and communicate effectively will increase substantially; ALL students will be involved in activities that promote and demonstrate good citizenship, community service, and personal responsibility; the percentage of ALL students who are competent in more than one language will substantially increase; and ALL students will be knowledgeable about the diverse cultural heritage of this Nation and about the world community." (Goals 2000, 5-7).

Reasons for my dissenting perspective

Why, then, does the writer dissent from the *inclusion* movement; a movement which seems to be clearly in line with the moral development of our country, and with the development of aims in schooling which are in line with this moral development. Here are a few of his reasons.

A silly idea

First and foremost, the idea of including children and youth with significant disabilities in regular classrooms is simply a silly, completely illogical way of thinking about improving either the quality of learning of everyone in the regular classroom or of the disabled student. To suggest that numbers of collaborating teachers and paraprofessionals will be able to work effectively with students while they are together in a single classroom challenges one's credulity. Clearly those who conceive of a classroom environment operating in this way have no realistic understanding of the nature of classroom teaching and learning.

Destruction of a field of specialization

For the past forty-five years the domain of special education has been differentiating itself, developing analytical techniques and methodological skills which have been designed to handle a large array of disabilities. People in this domain of professional endeavor possess many knowledges and skills which are vitally necessary to those with mental, emotional and physical disabilities. To make an effort to destroy what has taken so long to develop challenges my comprehension. It would be downright shortsighted, if not entirely blind, to permit this to take place.

Family experience

Certainly one contributing factor in my thinking has been a lifetime family association with a retarded man; a foster brother who entered the writer's household when he was six weeks old. Jim has provided me with much concrete experience

about the needs and the attention which is required of mentally retarded people. In my judgment he would not have benefited from schooling in a regular classroom had such an opportunity emerged when he was in school. If such an opportunity had emerged I feel confident in saying that our family would have used every means at our disposal to prevent Jim from being integrated into a regular classroom. Indeed, it would have been immoral to have compelled him to associate with students who had so much more capacity to learn, to think, to make decisions than he had.

It is reasonable to assume, as I do, that the hypothetical family reaction to the integration of Jim into a regular classroom which I have suggested is not an isolated example of opposition to this movement. I suspect that many parents with mentally handicapped children would feel much the same.

A contradictory movememt

The political nature of the call for inclusion is also a troubling one. Education has always seemed to me to be too important to be left in the hands of politicians; for they often have constituencies to serve which lie beyond the walls of the school. For instance, a recent federal appeals court in California has ordered a public school district to consider placing a moderately retarded student in a general education classroom. The Clinton Administration sided with the parents in this case. The court noted that the district's position that the student must be placed in a special education program "runs directly counter to the congressional preference that children

with disabilities be educated in regular classrooms." (The bottom line, 3). At the same time teachers in these regular classrooms will continue to be asked to establish high expectations for their students and to get their students to achieve increasingly high levels of achievement. Clearly the need to include children with disabilities in regular classrooms, particularly if they possess genuine disabilities, creates a contradictory teaching environment for the classroom teacher.

Making the public school a wastebasket

It seems clear to me that, because the public school is likely to be the receiver of many young people possessing disabilities which ought not be integrated into the regular classroom, that the public school will gradually become a dumping ground for those kinds of students. The quality of learning is bound to decrease, and test scores and other evaluative measures are very likely going to decrease. When the public becomes aware of this deterioration further cries will be heard for the privatization of schooling. Cries for revitalizing education with the use of vouchers and tax credits are bound to escalate as other social agencies clamor for the right to assume the responsibilities for managing and operating our public schools.

The 'feeling good' syndrome

Much of the inclusion literature stresses the need to integrate students into the regular classroom in order to enhance their self-esteem, to create a feeling of belongingness, and to enable regular classroom youngsters to appreciate those

with disabilities; in other words, to make people 'feel good". Now I see nothing wrong with feeling good about oneself, or about the environment in which one finds oneself. It seems to me, however, that such feelings are very difficult to teach directly; rather, they emerge from the feeling one acquires as a result of learning or of doing something well. And such learning is likely to go on best in environments which enable one to experience individualized attention to ones needs from a specialist who can handle them with a maximum amount of competency and a minimum amount of delay.

Let me cite a personal example here. Recently, as the result of a physical examination, my family doctor recommended that I see a specialist for an additional examination. I accepted his recommendation and received a highly specialized examination in another office, some distance away. Certainly I did not feel that I had been denied the opportunity to feel good about myself. Indeed, just the opposite occurred. I felt good knowing that I had a family doctor who respected me and who knew enough about his own limitations to recommend that I be examined by a specialist. This, it seems to me, is analogous to the role of the special education teacher and children with disabilities. Clearly these young people will be receiving treatment from a specialist, in an environment which is conducive to a small specialist-client relationship. Out of such a relationship one is much more likely to acquire a sense of belongness and significance than by being integrated into classrooms in which one has far fewer opportunities to have

ones needs attended to. Where, in reality, one is likely to feel the psychological impact of not being able to handle the demands in the classroom with the same measure of ease as the regular students.

Stress on outcomes based schooling

The literature of inclusion seems to point very much in the direction of performance-based learning. This form of learning is the highly structured, highly specific, predetemined learning which we associate with the technocratic, industrial model of learning. Clearly it suggests a highly behavioristic, quantifiable sort of learning environment, one comfortable in a highly structured school environment, with a large measure of competition. This is not the sort of environment in which children with significant disabilities can learn and develop most effectively.

Reduction in class size

There is little evidence in the literature that those who are advocating inclusion recognize the need to reduce class size considerably as children with disabilities are integrated into regular classrooms. Reducing class size, of course, would result in the need for larger and larger numbers of teachers; and the consequent expense which such numbers would entail. This is precisely what those who advocate inclusion would like to avoid.

Recommendations

Recommendation No. I:

Professional educational organizations, for instance,

the New York State Association of Teacher Educators, should recommend to the Commissioner of Education and to the Board of Regents that a state educational summit designed to address the problem of inclusion be convened during the 1994-95 school year. All professional organizations, parent organizations, teachers and anyone interested in the problems created by the inclusion movement ought to be invited to attend and participate.

Recommendation No. 2:

Professional educational organizations, as well as individuals ought to contact Representatives and Senators in Washington to express their deep concerns about the ramifications for the developoment of high quality public education of elements of P.L. 94-142 as well as of IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Indeed, these political leaders should be requested to explain to the larger public just how they think some of the provisions of these Acts can result in anything but a reduction in the quality of learning by the regular students attending our public schools.

Recommendation No. 3

Every effort should be made by special educators to make certain that only those students who need their specialized treatment are considered disabled. Students who do not meet the criteria deemed necessary to be considered disabled ought to be returned to their regular classrooms.

If the work of Kozol is any indication, there may be many young people, often children and youth of color, who have been

classified as EMR, or LD students who really belong in regular classrooms. (Kozol).

Clearly , Idstein believes this when he claims that , "We also have to acknowledge and confront the racial issue . . . Minority students *are* disproportionately represented in special education classrooms, and we must muster the integrity and the courage to confront such issues squarely and to seek answers." (Idstein, 340).

Certainly, as Kent points out, "there have been students placed in special education classrooms who should have remained in regular classses. Special education teachers," she claims, "know this and have tried to right some of the wrongs. But," she goes on, "total inclusion does not help all, and probably not most - special education students . . . ." (Kent). I concur with her view entirely.

This problem is addressed in a slightly different way by the results which emerged from a study which was commissioned by the National Academy of Sciences. The study concluded, in refernce to children classified as *educable mentally retarded* (the largest category of so-called retarded children), *learning disabled,* or children eligible for Chapter 1 review (the largest of the compensatory education programs) that "we find no educational justification for the current categorization system that supports these three groups in the schools." (Winner's all, 26-27).

It seems reasonable to conclude that there are a significant number of children and youth who have been labelled

as learning disabled, or educable mentally retared, particularly the former, who could and would benefit from being integrated into regular classrooms, and who would not cause undo concern for others in these rooms.

Recommendation No. 4

BOCES centers and colleges throughout New York State should establish firm and lasting linkages which will enable them to generate professional development programs which will provide teachers, school administrators and parents with opportunities to become aware of how best to meet the needs of any disabled students who might be integrated into regular classrooms.

Recommendation No. 5

All parents of normal children who are in regular public school classrooms ought to be fully apprised of the inclusion movement and its ramifications for the classroom environments in which their children may be included if this movement continues to any great extent.

Conclusion

Clearly there is unequivocal evidence to support the claim that, throughout the history of our American culture, our nation has been persistently engaged in the pursuit of humanitarian moral ideals. Further, there is clear evidence that, ever since the work of the Committee of Ten a bit more than a hundred years ago, and the subsequent efforts of many, many other committees, commissions, and theoreticians, we have attempted

to generate aims and curricular programs for our public schools which are clearly in line with the enlarging, moral development of our nation.

Now, because of the impetus for action provided by P.L. 94-142, along with the stimulus for action which has been generated by a related piece of legislation, P.L. 101-336, The Americans with Disabilities Act, it would be wise for us to hold up action for a bit, to take stock of just what is being asked of teachers, administrators, students and parents; and just how is the inclusion movement likely to impact the interests and demands of our liberal democracy. Else we are likely to act on alternatives the consequences of which are likely to cause more harm than good.

What might be done? Clearly, we need to generate an expanded paradigm of the nature and purpose of public schooling, a vision which integrates ALL children and youth into our schools in a way which clearly respects the needs and interests of regular children in regular classrooms, and, at the same time, guarantees that every effort will be made to provide the array of specially trained educators needed to handle the unique differences and capacities of those exceptional children and youth who are significantly disabled. Given the political pressures which are being generated by the public laws which have been generated and adopted by the legislative branch and signed into law by the executive branch of our federal government, political entities which are seemingly unaccountable for their actions in this realm of

legislative decision-making, this will be no easy task.

END NOTES

A new compact for learning-improving public elementary, middle, and secondary education results in the 1990s. (March, 1991). Albany, N.Y.: The State Education Department.

Broudy, Harry S., Smith, B. Othanel, and Burnett, Joe R. (1963). Democracy and excellence in American secondary education. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Cardinal principles of secondary education. (1918). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin No. 35.

The bottom line-A newsletter for New York State United Teachers local leaders. (Feb. 18, 1994). "Court ruling favors 'inclusion'." Albany, N.Y.: New York State United Teachers. v.12, n.12.

Education for ALL American youth-A further look.(1944). Washington, D.C.: Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association of the United States and the American Association of School Administrators.

Gardner, David Pierpont. (April, 1983). A nation at risk:The imperative for educational reform. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Goals 2000: Educate America Act. (July 1, 1993). Washington, D.C. Union Calendar No. 93. 103D Congress, 1st Session, H.R. 1804, Report No. 103-168.

Idstein, Pete. (Dec. 1993). "Swimming against the mainstream." Kappan. v.75, v.4.

Jones, Nancy Lee. (July 27, 1990; Updated March 18, 1992). "The Americans with disabilities act (ADA): An overview of major provisions." Congressional Research Service Report

for Congress. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service - The Library of Congress.

Kent, Mary E. (March 21, 1994). "Success stories in special ed." New York Teacher. v.35, n.14.

Kozol, Jonathan. (1991). Savage inequalities. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.

National Education Association. (1893). Cited in: Kliebard, Herbert M. (1986). The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893-1958. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

P. L. 101-336. (July 26, 1990). "Sec.202 discrimination." Americans with disabilities act of 1990. Title II-Public services. Subtitle A. Prohibition against discrimination and other generally applicable provisions. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Report of the Harvard Committee. (1945). General education in a free society. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Rippa, S. Alexander. (1992). Education in a free Society: An American history, seventh edition. New York: Longman.

Shanker, Albert. (Feb. 21, 1994). "Where we stand: A 'typical' story." New York Teacher. v.35, n.12.

The structure and administration of education in American democracy. (1938). Washington, D.C.: National Education Association of the United States.

Walker, Decker F. and Soltis, Jonas F. (1986). Curriculum and aims. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Wertheimer, Linda K. (March 25, 1994). "Troubled schools look for solutions." Rochester, N.Y.: Democrat and Chronicle.

"Winners all: A call for inclusive schools." (Oct., 1992). Alexandria, VA.: The National Association of State Boards of Education.